

the

c e n t r a l e u r o p e a n u n i v e r s i t y

WEEKLY

An independent newspaper by CEU students and alumni

February 4, 2015, Year 5, Issue 56



[TH]INK

THIS ISSUE FEATURES THOUGHT-PROVOKING ARTICLES SELECTED
FROM THE SUBMISSIONS TO OUR CHARLIE HEBDO CALL

THE HORROR OF DIVERSITY

Attending the “Charlie Hebdo” solidarity march in Paris, on 11 January, Prime Minister Viktor Orbán perhaps unintentionally struck at the heart of the matter, beyond endless debates regarding free speech and the ‘nature of Islam,’ by calling economic immigration “...a bad thing in Europe [...] because it only brings trouble and danger to the peoples of Europe.” He went on to elaborate:

“While I am PM, Hungary will definitely not become an immigration destination. We do not want to see significantly sized minorities with different cultural characteristics and backgrounds among us. We want to keep Hungary as Hungary.”¹

The meaning of these remarks is that immigrants endanger the welfare and values of people living in (morally and economically more developed) Western capitalist democracies. The so-called argument runs like this: “Our civil liberties and human rights were won through centuries of moral and societal progress, the result of countless sacrifices and difficult challenges. Now we must safe-guard our freedom and prosperity from those who seek to take advantage of them [i.e. terrorists, radical leftists, immigrants etc.]” This rhetorical constitution of the ‘enemy’ is characteristic of the symbolic and material patterns of inclusion/exclusion that any group must establish as a pre-requisite to its existence. Without clear and accepted rules of membership, groups cannot effectively function, and this is also true of democracies, where decision-making is intimately bound up with citizenship.

Diversity, whether ethnic, religious, or of opinion, complicates things in our contemporary capitalist democracies that submit to the logic of the global market and the interests of a transnational capitalist class. Diversity not so much questions as it demands the idea of politics as ongoing dialogue between alternative world-views and differently positioned social groups; this has been supplanted by the ‘austerity, security and innovation’ discourse of the European Union. The grotesque consequence is that our fa-

vourite authoritarian ‘villain,’ Viktor Orbán in fact openly expresses the fears and positions of ‘more respectable’ political figures. Let us not forget how EU Commission President Jean-Claude Juncker promised in Parliament “A New Start for Europe” that includes “securing the EU’s borders” with millions of euros of increased funding for its border control agency, FRONTEX.²

New political alternatives are hard to come by. In Hungary, the Migrant Solidarity Group (MigSzol) was founded in 2012 by refugees and asylum seekers living in reception centres and seeking a more humane and transparent treatment from the government.³ Two years later this grassroots, non-hierarchical and consensus-driven group also includes Hungarians and expats (many of them from CEU), who dedicate their time, efforts, and passion to build a more inclusive society and a more open kind of politics. This includes giving voice to the immigrants attacked in Prime Minister Orbán’s comments in a recent demonstration in Budapest’s Deák Ferenc tér.⁴ In contrast to mainstream political attitudes, MigSzol embraces diversity as something intrinsic to democracy and essential for the well-being of everyone, regardless of membership to states, unions or alliances.

~ Cătălin Buzoianu

Sociology and Social Anthropology graduate, Romania

MIGSZOL
MIGRANT SOLIDARITY GROUP OF HUNGARY

¹ <https://euobserver.com/justice/127172> ² http://ec.europa.eu/priorities/docs/pg_en.pdf

³ <http://www.migszol.com/who-we-are.html> ⁴ <https://www.facebook.com/events/1615554081999995>

SAVE DEBATES ABOUT FREE SPEECH FOR A CALMER DAY

The attacks on Charlie Hebdo are not the right time or context for a debate about free speech and Western values.

*I*t is a newspaper's duty," wrote the Chicago Times in 1861, "to print the news and raise hell." The Committee to Protect Journalists reports that no fewer than 61 journalists and 11 media workers were killed in this line of duty in 2014. The murdered at *Charlie Hebdo* in Paris become the first names on a new list; killed, as all the others, for nothing more than something they said, by people who did not want them to say it.

Yet few of us have reacted to this attack as though it were the same as the others. It strikes us as something different: some particular, complex horror, uniquely difficult to understand and interpret. It is true these attacks rarely happen in the secure democracies of the West, and make those of us who call such places home feel less safe. It is rare, also, that this sort of thug should take aim at the heart of a news organisation by storming the offices, and so obviously rejecting their whole program of work with barbarous violence.

But for many, the *Charlie Hebdo* attacks have been so difficult to process because it is not easy for everyone to identify with the victims: their work exceeded the boundaries of taste, or sought actively to offend, upset, and undermine. Nobody believes that there could ever be justice in killing over speech, but the attack provoked expression of a range of views on what we should, and should not, say.

"let people have their particular and contentious views for now, while we are all still coming to terms"

There are legitimate questions to ask and answer in such a debate. The West, secure in its Cold War victory, no longer faces a truly existential threat to its people and its values. There is a place, now, for internal debate about whether protection of free speech needs to be absolute, since we no longer have to buttress our public values to keep them from completely falling down. But the fact that a debate is legitimate doesn't mean that it can be had at any time, in any context, and these attacks are the wrong context to have such a debate effectively or tastefully.

Our public values are what they are, and the legal and social boundaries on acceptable speech are more or less clear. But the truth is, few of us find our private values entirely matched to those promoted and accepted in the public square. When something like the *Charlie Hebdo* attack happens, we all find ourselves with thoughts that would be difficult to express publically. Murders so brutal, so callous, and of people who have a complex and ambiguous role in our public discourse, are things we all need to come to terms with, and we must do so in our own way, on terms of our own. It would be dishonest, inadequate, and dissatisfying to pretend that we can all respond to such an awful thing the same way, or in a way that everyone else can accept or understand.

Nevertheless, some of us feel the need to comment publically in order to do that. For others it is our job to do so. When that happens, charitability should demand of us that we recognise such responses cannot ever be expressed in terms we can all accept, and the necessity for public comment does not, at these times, imply that comment should be held to the usual narrower standards of acceptable public discourse. Much of the comment on the attacks has taken a particular and contentious view of what happened, and what the appropriate response should be. But in the context of something so awful and incomprehensible, we should be generous, and let people have their particular and contentious views for now, while we are all still coming to terms. Even if we believe it is not appropriate for public discourse to extend that far at normal times, we must believe it now. The harder news is to understand, the more necessary it becomes to conduct debate in the widest possible terms of pluralism.

The hashtag #jesuischarlie has been the focus for much of the controversy, as the hardest question this attack raised is how much we can or should identify with *Charlie Hebdo*. In relation to that, as with all the debate that has happened, I would plead only that we interpret the contributions of others as generously as we can, and find reasons to agree, rather than disagree, with the sincere expressions of others. *I am Charlie*, insofar as I do not want to be killed for anything I say, and I am not sure use of the hashtag need imply anything more than that. There is something ugly in responding to this tragedy by climbing into lesser trenches than that, and start fighting about what speech is permissible, right, or wrong. It is a fair debate, but a debate for another day.

~ Dan Hartas
Philosophy, United Kingdom

DON'T JUDGE A FOREST BY A TREE

It is a struggle to think what to say about the Charlie Hebdo shootings in a piece such as this. The difficulty arises in figuring out what remains to be said. The 'defense of free speech' sermons have been done to death, plenty have pointed out the hypocrisy of many of the world leaders who attended the rally in support of free speech and yet more have called for the focus to be on the Boko Haram atrocities, which received less attention in the wake of Paris despite the much, much larger body count.

It seems all of the sensible angles have been covered, with many more spouting nonsense all over social media, Fox News, and other sources from which you would expect better. Our lives have been saturated with related stories and I am sick of hearing those words now – "Charlie Hebdo". And yet, I feel compelled to write about it.

In truth, what bothers me the most, and what I want to comment on, is the blind forthrightness of the commentators. As soon as the first reports began to trickle in, my head went down and I did my best to avoid getting hooked on the live streams, and eternally-looping TV news channels, for as long as possible. It was clear the coverage would become ubiquitous, everywhere, unceasing – not because of the magnitude of the attacks, of course, but because of what they would represent, because of where they happened, and to whom they happened. If any evidence of that is needed, one need only look to the lopsided reporting of the Paris events over the Boko Haram massacre (or indeed the twists and turns of the on-going conflict in eastern Ukraine).

I knew that I would hear opinion after opinion, from one point of view and then the other, which would regardless carry the conviction of someone absolutely assured of their analysis, totally convinced that they saw things as they really were and knew how we should all respond.

So here we all are, facing what so far is the defining civilizational question of the 21st Century: an incredibly complicated fabric involving values, beliefs, politics, history and culture spread across the Earth (if the collection of world leaders is anything to go by), all informing what is being boiled down to various iterations of A versus B by left, right and centre: the West versus Islam, free speech

versus terrorism, bad immigration policy versus good immigration policy.

Slightly more complex analysis made arguments over the right to freedom of speech – to whatever degree – and the failure, or not, of Muslim integration in European cities, or the difference between random acts of violence by disaffected youths and radical Islamic terrorism. Some even looked at the multiple interpretations of the Quran all the way down to the socialisation of, and lives lived by, the attackers. But no one person, no state, no religion, no organization, journalist or any other body has the means to fully comprehend in its entirety an issue so complex.

These are issues very few people are overly vocal about until something awful happens in some place with a name they recognize, then suddenly everyone is an expert. In reality, nobody, not even the vocal (especially not the very vocal), is an expert in all of these things. Those who are regarded as experts in one aspect or another will still have their failings and misconceptions, especially when the backdrop is so impossibly wide.

I follow the Charlie Hebdo af fair now just hoping for someone to come forward, in an article, a public address, anything, and assert the only thing that we can really be sure of is there are so many scales on which to measure that we cannot know exactly where these people fell on each one, so many factors at work that we can never know exactly – exactly – what this attack represented. All we can do is speculate.

Most importantly, we should not attempt to use this attack as a benchmark or a model against which to judge the next one. In doing so, we are losing the chance to discover what happened to each individual driven to do violence and gain a fuller understanding of what is happening in our societies. Instead we are promoting reactionary conclusivism which serves pointless argumentation and pre-existing political agendas. It is time to admit what we don't know and what we don't understand so we can begin to know and understand it better.

-- John McLean

Public Policy, United Kingdom



(www.journalism.co.uk)

INTERVIEW WITH ANDREW GILLESPIE, U.S. ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

This week CEU hosted an event featuring Senior Scientist Andrew Gillespie from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as part of the Hungarian Sustainable University Network (HUSUN) program. HUSUN is a collaboration between student activist groups and the U.S. Department of State's Regional Environmental, Science & Technology, and Health (ESTH) Hub for Central and Eastern Europe. The questions below posed to Andrew were compiled by students currently involved in the development of the HUSUN.*

Could you describe the responsibilities associated with your role as the Associate Director of the EPA's National Exposure Research Laboratory? What impactful research projects have you initiated in cooperation with your team in the past few months?

As the Associate Director for the National Exposure Research laboratory (NERL), I am the senior science leader for the laboratory which consists of approximately 225 scientists in a variety of disciplines. We study how and where stressors (chemicals, invasive species, etc.) originate, move through the environment, and impact humans and ecosystems. Working with the Laboratory Director and six Division Directors, we prioritize different lines of research and provide oversight to ensure that projects are completed and research products delivered. A large part of my role has to do with scientific quality control, overseeing the peer review process to ensure that our products meet the highest standards of scientific integrity.

We have a full workplan underway and as such have not initiated any new major projects in the past few months. Some examples of impactful research projects currently underway include:

- Continued development of the EnviroAtlas, a web-based tool for enabling communities to consider ecosystem goods and services when planning development activities. For example, one project involves analyzing the costs/benefits of urban trees for improving the quality of life in poor communities.
- Assessment of the potential impacts on water quality of hydraulic fracturing for oil and gas extraction.
- Continued development of the

Community Multi-Scale Air Quality (CMAQ) model, a large system model used to predict and understand changes in air quality at the national, regional and local scale. Among other projects we are applying CMAQ to improve our understanding of future climate change impacts.

One of the focus areas of your research is the impact of climate change on forest ecosystems. Could you explain briefly the connection between climate change and the health of forest ecosystems?

Forest health and sustainability are intimately tied to climate. Climate consists of long term trends in basic atmospheric parameters such as temperature, precipitation, wind patterns, storm frequency and intensity, and other attributes. These parameters (along with biophysical parameters such as soil quality, nutrient availability elevation, quantity of sunlight, etc) are key in determining ecological niches, or places where certain tree species have adapted to thrive. If the parameters change – warmer or colder temperatures, higher or lower precipitation levels, etc. - then the niches change, and existing forests may find themselves under increased stress. If the stress levels get too high, forests become more susceptible to other stressors such as insects, diseases, or forest fires, leading to a decline in forest health.

The connection is part of a system which also operates in the other direction: forests can affect climate, e.g. by moderating the storage and evapotranspiration of water, and by sequestering carbon in biomass which removes CO₂ from the atmosphere. In summary it is a dynamic system. Climate is always changing, and forests



ANDREW GILLESPIE

are resilient and can adapt to changes given sufficient time. However, sudden changes in climate – for example associated with recent human use of fossil fuels – may push some forests beyond a stable equilibrium, causing rapid negative changes in forest health.

Most of us have become quite familiar with campaigns encouraging us to plant trees and protect forest ecosystems, especially in vital locations such as rainforests. Globally, are we in better shape now than we were 10 or 20 years ago with regards to the health of forests?

I do not think there is a single universal answer for this. I believe the level of global awareness about the link between climate, forests, and human well-being is higher than it was 20 years ago, which is helpful. Our level of scientific understanding of the linkages between these things is also much higher, which is good because it can help us devise strategies to mitigate or adapt to climate change.

* Please note that views expressed here are the views of Andrew Gillespie and may not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the United States government. No official US Government endorsement should be inferred.



But there is still much stress being applied to the landscape, in many places, due to many different drivers such as growing populations, desire for economic development, and the effects of climate change itself. So bottom line, I think things are better in some places and worse in others. Because forest health and climate change are issues that transcend national boundaries, the challenge is to figure out a way to get countries to work together, in a way that allows each country to advance their interests while also advancing (or at least not hurting) common global interests.

With regards to the protection and enhancement of forest ecosystems in the United States, what is the role of the EPA?

In the US system, the EPA is charged with protecting human health and the environment from environmental threats. It is a broad mission which has its roots some 45 years ago, as a response to terrible water and air pollution problems which existed at that time. Our primary role is to make and enforce rules and policies to implement the environmental laws passed by the US Congress and signed by the President. We do not have authority to make rules and regulations outside this framework; everything we do has to be under a law such as the Clean Air Act or the Safe Drinking Water Act. EPA conducts research primarily to support the EPA work of formulating good, effective policies and regulations.

So while EPA has an indirect role in protecting forests by protecting air and water quality, direct management of

forests in the US is regulated through a variety of other Agencies, depending primarily on the ownership of the forest. For example management and protection of government-owned forests is under the direction of the owning government Agency (which may be federal or state). However, 2/3 of the forest estate in the US is owned by private individuals. Protection and enhancement of those forests falls under the jurisdiction of state (not federal) forest management regulations, which vary greatly from state to state.

Does the EPA cooperate with any European or other foreign environmental institutions in research and policy development?

The US EPA has extensive international cooperation and collaborations. In fact we have an entire branch of our Agency, the Office of International and Tribal Affairs, which focuses on promoting international collaboration. We recognize that many other countries including Hungary have excellent researchers in many areas of common interest, and we seek to collaborate whenever possible.

In my Office of Research and Development, our scientists participate in many international activities both with individual countries as well as international organizations such as the World Health Organization and the EU Joint Research Centre. Many examples of cooperation with Europe can be found at <http://www2.epa.gov/international-cooperation/epas-efforts-europe>

Can you comment on any similar trends regarding forestry issues in the U.S. and Central Europe, specifically in Hungary, and what can we learn from each other?

I will probably be better positioned to discuss this after I have a few months experience in Central Europe, but I can offer a few hypotheses about similarities which I hope to test during my visit:

- People in both countries value their forests, and they value them for many reasons: economic (e.g. timber production as an enterprise), environmental (e.g. providing clean water), and spiritual (places to experience nature).
- All of our forests are at some risk

from rapid climate change. We have some ideas about the nature of that change in the near term (probably higher average temperatures, more extreme temperatures, changes in precipitation patterns) but there is still substantial uncertainty about the timing and magnitude of the change, as well as the likely response on the ground.

- Both countries have substantial scientific expertise in the area of forestry, ecology, climate science, and other disciplines which can help inform good policies to mitigate or adapt to climate change.

- Dealing with climate change is going to require many adaptive management experiments – trying different strategies, measuring the results, and adjusting the strategy. So one thing we can learn from each other is what works, where, and maybe why – and then see if we can replicate successful results in other places.

Lastly, what insights are you hoping to gain from your time spent visiting Universities and teaching in Hungary?

Hungary has been inhabited by humans for much, much longer than North America, so one thing I am interested in is seeing whether there are any noticeable, measureable differences in the forest as a result of this longer association.

Secondly, I am aware that Hungary has a very different social-political history from the US. Since forest management depends very much on people and their values, I am interested in seeing what that might mean in terms of Hungarian values and attitudes towards forests – and what that implies for possible forest management solutions, including solutions to climate adaptation. I have traveled in many countries and seen many different approaches to forest management – some of them would not work very well in the US, but sometimes I encounter people who have solved a common problem in an innovative (to me) way, and that is what I find very exciting.

~ Logan Strenchok

Environmental Sciences, United States

THE SIGNAL AND THE NOISE

We do not condone the Charlie Hebdo murders. Yet soundbites and slogans fail to capture the full story that explains the unfolding of events in the chaos around us.

CH is a satirical magazine that ran the risk of inciting strong reactions, albeit nothing that deserved such a shockingly brutal attack on its staff.

Publication of offensive cartoons since 2006 led to a violent overreaction by extremists - but two "extremist" wrongs don't make a "moderate" right. When world leaders descended on Paris in solidarity, the gesture was important. But had the world leaders also acknowledged the incredibly insulting, and thus polarising, sentiments of the cartoons depicting the most important figure in the Islam faith, fair and just actions could have been taken. Instead, the issue remained squarely about freedom of speech, but not about hate speech. Terrorism looks for ways to manipulate, and they found an opportunity in CH's cartoons. However the attacks in Paris are not the main issue in this narrative—it is the forgotten victims of this violence.

A recent article by the BBC tried to bring some perspective to the West regarding the victims of religious terrorism. It explored the idea that the majority of attacks by Muslims are aimed at, or indeed end up killing, other Muslims. While in Afghanistan for a year in 2011, I heard several stories of Taliban intimidation, corruption and violence. Every Afghan colleague I knew had a family member, friend or acquaintance die violently and many more who were jailed or had escaped near misses. Later, while

working as part of a humanitarian organization in northern Lebanon prior to starting at CEU, the Islamic State's incursion on Lebanon's southeastern border in August 2014 set the staff on edge as several had husbands or brothers in the Army. What I thought were just ditches in the roads on my way to work were the result of attacks a decade ago.

Syria's Alawite minority continue to expel its own citizens, and the Islamic State target Shia Muslims in their vicious campaign. To date, there has not been a show of solidarity against Assad's regime or IS equivalent to the demonstration after the CH attacks. Is it because inherently, we believe Western, "Christian" lives are worth more than non-Western, non-Christian ones? Or is it because freedom from fear is lower down the hierarchy of rights than freedom of speech?

If CEU does stand against violence and extremism, then let's start using our freedom of speech to talk about actions and policies that might help ameliorate core causes, and to encourage formal and informal dialogue between people of all faiths to foster inclusiveness and understanding. More than ever, we need to dig deeper when we're asked to sign a petition, join a protest and hashtag a slogan. That's why we're at CEU - to learn, engage and critically think.

~ Rachel Shue, Australia
and

Carly Rivezzo, United States
Public Policy



Cartoon by Erikson

WHO IS CHARLIE HEBDO?



The phrase Je suis Charlie rapidly spread through the world after the terrible terrorist attacks in Paris in early January 2015. Millions of people embraced the phrase via their social networks or blogs. It can be questioned, though, whether people understand what the statement really means. And there are some who did ask this question in public. For instance, New York Times columnist David Brooks argued that he is “not Charlie Hebdo” and justified this seemingly scandalous view – from the perspective of a democratic and open society – by pointing to the uncertainty of the statement.¹

So, if I am considering, in the Hamletian manner of to be or not to be (Charlie Hebdo), according to what criterion should I decide? The obvious answer is, it depends on what being Charlie Hebdo means. And it may mean at least three not necessary complementary things; an issue that has been somewhat neglected in the public discourse.

Firstly, the phrase may stand for nothing more or less than solidarity with the victims of the attack, their families, colleagues and friends, the communities they belonged to, and France as a whole. Within this meaning, a sharp ‘no’ to any form of violence, including terrorism by anybody regardless of ethnic, cultural or religious background, is incorporated.

“Thus, if somebody asks me whether I am Charlie Hebdo, I would answer, it depends.”

Secondly, it might mean a voice in favour of freedom of speech, even if a particular form of speech is controver-

sial and may be seen as defamation or blasphemy by some communities. This is a standing for an extensive interpretation of freedom of speech but not support for speech that fails the clear-and-present danger test, that is, whether in a particular context it incites violence.

Finally, if I am Charlie Hebdo, it might be that I am supporting the particular lens through which this magazine viewed the world; in other words, I agree with their views and would be willing to ‘become one of them.’

Thus, if somebody asks me whether I am Charlie Hebdo, I would answer, it depends. I am certainly Charlie Hebdo in its first meaning, as every person with a sense of humanity should be.

In its second meaning, I would say yes but would add that we must consider the quality of public discourse in the given context and environment. I think any three-word statement is unsatisfactory for such a complex issue as the scope of freedom of speech, so in this case I would request a more extensive discussion.

And I would not feel I have the right to answer to the question in its third meaning, simply because I do not have the insights into the world of Charlie Hebdo, which is, even if we considered it as monolithic despite the number of people working on it, deeply embedded in the French context, publishes in French, a language I do not speak, and has a diverse history of more than three decades.

This ‘three-step’ consideration is what I think would be required every time someone says they are or are not Charlie Hebdo. Because the answer is far from being as simple as its three words would suggest and, although short answers are often welcome and sometimes needed, this time they imply different and important positions.

~ Max Steuer

IRES, Slovakia

1. <http://www.nytimes.com/2015/01/09/opinion/david-brooks-i-am-not-charlie-hebdo.html>

SUSTAINABLE FASHION: RE-VINTAGE

The economy of the developed world is based on a culture of “throw it out and buy a new one.” We rarely bring our battered shoes to the shoemaker any more, although the life span of our mass-produced footwear has decreased considerably throughout the modern era. The same goes for other fashion items, clothes and accessories. But does old necessarily mean useless? Not at all. Vintage clothing, that is, wearing garments from previous decades, proves that old items have a place in our contemporary life. In fact, our approach to products made in the past affect how our future will look like. I have interviewed Krisztina Szerjan, head of Pop Sick Vintage, a company selling vintage items and producing re-vintage garments and bags, in order to learn more about sustainable fashion.



As we can read on your blog, Pop Sick Vintage is devoted to popularizing vintage and re-vintage clothing and accessories. Re-vintage is not a widely used term, could you explain what it refers to?

Krisztina Szerjan (KSZ): To put it simply, re-vintage is the recycling of old clothes and textiles into new clothes and accessories. It can also be called ‘reworked clothing,’ but I prefer to call it ‘re-vintage’ because this term is more telling. We can differentiate basically between two types of re-vintage: retailoring and redesign. Retailoring includes the improvement



of an old item by tiny but meaningful changes, such as replacing the buttons, removing shoulder-pads or altering the tailoring. Redesign means a more radical and a truly creative process, the combination of various old clothes or textiles into something totally new.

What kind of materials do you use for re-vintage purposes? And where do you find them?

Our aim is to find old but good quality materials. Good quality materials are mainly clothes and textiles manufactured more than twenty years ago, as in the 1990s the textile industry moved its factories to China, and later to India, Bangladesh, and Cambodia. Under these new conditions, the garment industry started to produce predominantly low-quality textiles, and clothes of ephemeral life span. Furthermore, we should not forget the moral aspect; these factories rely heavily on the labour of low-paid, often underage local populations and they are ‘famous’ for their unsafe and inhumane working conditions. As for our resources in Hungary, a good start for finding old but good quality materials is a visit to countryside second-hand markets.

Why should people buy re-vintage clothes?

If you buy re-vintage, you can fill up your wardrobe with good quality and unique clothes at a low price. I believe that re-vintage and vintage can

be a real alternative to fast-fashion items which are mass-produced and which typically do not last for more than one season. You can trust re-vintage items in that respect; clothes that are wearable twenty years after their manufacturing will definitely not lose their good quality in the upcoming ten or so years. Vintage and re-vintage in the garment industry is not just naïve nostalgia for old times. It highlights the general decline of quality in the field and encourages us to recycle good quality materials instead of increasing the production of low-quality new items. And last but not least, re-vintage also gives us an opportunity to make the best of our creativity and imagination and to transform our ideas into tangible fashion items without increasing our ecological footprint.



Thank you for talking to us about sustainable fashion!

You can check out re-vintage tote bags and crop tops at <http://www.pop-sickvintage.com/>.

~ Alexandra Medzibrodzsky
History PhD, Hungary

MOMENTS OF THE 2015 INTERCULTURAL FESTIVAL



WANT TO GET PUBLISHED?

Send your article to
ceuweekly@ceu.hu



Like us on Facebook!
www.facebook.com/TheCEUWeekly



ABOUT THE CEU WEEKLY

The CEU Weekly is a student-alumni initiative that seeks to provide CEU with a regularly issued newspaper. The CEU Weekly is a vehicle of expression for the diversity of the perspectives and viewpoints that integrate CEU's open society: free and respectful public debate is our aim. We offer a place in which current events and student reflections can be voiced. Plurality, respect, and freedom of speech are our guiding principles.

Editor in Chief: Eszter Kajtár

Managing Editor: Aaron Korenewsky

Contributors: Giavana Margo, Alexandra Medzibrodzky, Jacob Verhagen, S.A. Siwiec, Tamara Szűcs, Lindsay Zemler, Daniel Hartas, Max Steuer, John McLean, Rachel Shue, Logan Strenchock, Cătălin Buzoianu, Erik Kotlárík and Christina E. Hermann.